



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/018,503	04/04/2002	Timo Vitikainen	4925-190PUS	2657
7590	09/22/2005			EXAMINER
Michael C Stuart Cohen Pontani Lieberman & Pavane Suite 1210 551 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10176			SHIFERAW, ELENI A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2136	
DATE MAILED: 09/22/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/018,503	VITIKAINEN, TIMO
Examiner	Art Unit	
Eleni A. Shiferaw	2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/2/05.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments/amendments with respect to amended claims 1-43, presently pending claims 1-43, filed on June 24, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner would like to point out that this action is made final (MPEP 706.07a).
2. Typo for Prior Art of record is corrected as GB 2 280 085.
3. All necessary foreign priority documents have been received.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant argues that:
 - a. Independent claims 1, 10, and 16 are not taught by either of the references to include "*generating information about a mapping between an address of a subscriber in a second network and a subscriber identity, where the subscriber is identified in a VAS platform based on the mapping information*" (page 9 par. 2, and page 2 par. 1 & 3).
 - b. Dependent claims 2-9, 11-15, and 17-43 are allowable based upon their dependency on allowable claims 1, 10, and 16 (page 11 par. 2).

However, Examiner disagrees with applicant.

Regarding argument (a), Argument is not persuasive. McCombe teaches identifying a subscriber of a first network in a second network for roaming by generating a **mapping information between subscriber's address and second network and subscriber's identity** that is generating IMSI and issuing a publicly known number (“Mobile Station International IDSN Number” or **MSISDN**), that is, subscriber’s telephone number, by means of which calls to that subscriber are initiated by callers. (Abstract and page 11 lines 12-23). Dahm discloses proxy server transmitting subscriber’s request with subscriber ID and/or IP address, wherein subscriber is identified in the Value-Added platform based on subscriber’s ID and IP address (col. 7 lines 37-64, and col. 9 lines 58- col. 10 lines 24).

Regarding argument (b), examiner disagrees with applicant. Based on the arguments set forth by the examiner for argument (a), the dependent claims stand rejected.

The examiner is not trying to teach the invention but is merely trying to interpret the claim language in its broadest and reasonable meaning. Therefore, the examiner asserts that the system of the prior art, McCombe and Dahm do teach or suggest the subject matter as recited in independent claims 1, 10, and 16. Dependent claims 2-9, 11-15, and 17-43 are also rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reason set forth in this office action dated September 15, 2005. Accordingly, rejections for claims 1-43 are respectfully maintained.

Rejections

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 1-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCombe (GB 2 280 085 A) in view of Dahm et al. (Dahm, Patent No. US 6,301,471 B1).

As per claims 1 and 16, McCombe teaches an authentication method/system/device for identifying a subscriber of a first network (2) in a second network, wherein authentication server functionality for a VAS platform is provided, comprising the steps of:

a) allocating an address of said second network (9) to said subscriber (McCombe page 3 lines 4-page 4 lines 11; providing similar identification numbers for distant subscribers); and
b) generating information about a mapping between the subscriber's address said second network (9) and a subscriber identity (McCombe page 11 lines 12-23; generating IMSI, and MSISDN);

McCombe does not explicitly teach identifying a subscriber in the VAS platform based on the mapping info.

However Dahm discloses:

c) transmitting the mapping to said second network (Dahm col. 8 lines 15-20, and col. 9 lines 58-col. 10 lines 4; subscriber ID, proxy server transmitting mobile phone subscriber's request with subscriber ID), wherein said subscriber is identified in the VAS platform based on said mapping information (Dahm col. 10 lines 20-24; subscriber is identified and VAS is

provided in the second network server to the identified subscriber), wherein said authentication client means (52) is a RADIUS client (Dahm Fig. 4 No. 440; remote second network server).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ the teachings of Dahm within the system of McCombe because it would identify a subscriber from the second network server and the second network server offers a value added service to the identified subscriber of the first network.

As per claim 10, it has similar limitations as claim 1; therefore, it is being rejected under the same rationale over McCombe in view of Dahm. In addition, Dahm teaches:

b) an authentication server (8) (Dahm Fig. 4 No. 440 and col. 10 lines 10-12 and col. 10 lines 59-65) provided in said second network (9) and adapted to log and maintain said mapping information (Dahm col. 10 lines 50-65);

c) wherein said authentication server (8) (Dahm Fig. 4 No. 440) is a server for a VAS platform (7) (Dahm col. 10 lines 19-24) provided in said second network (9) (Dahm Fig. 4 No. 440), wherein said VAS platform (7) is adapted to identify said subscriber (1) based on said mapping information (Dahm col. 10 lines 19-24 and col. 8 lines 16-20).

As per claim 2, both McCombe and Dahm teach all the subject matter as described above. An authentication method/system/device, wherein said mapping information is transmitted to said second network, when said mapping between said address in said second network and the subscriber identity has changed (McCombe col. 3 lines 4-col. 4 lines 11; it is obvious to transmit new mapping information to the second network server when mapping information and

subscriber identity has changed because it would always be available in the authentication server for value-added service).

As per claims 3, 14, 18, and 37-39, both McCombe and Dahm teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition McCombe teaches an authentication method/system/device, wherein said subscriber identity is at least one of an IMSI and an MSISDN of the subscriber (McCombe col. 11 lines 12-23).

As per claims 4, 19, and 20, both McCombe and Dahm teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Dahm teaches an authentication method/system/device, wherein said mapping information is transmitted in an access request message (Dahm col. 9 lines 58-col. 10 lines 4 and col. 11 lines 1-31). The rational for combining are the same as claim 1 above.

As per claim 5, both McCombe and Dahm teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition McCombe teaches an authentication method/system/device, wherein said request access message is a RADIUS access request message (McCombe col. 8 lines 13-22).

As per claim 6, both McCombe and Dahm teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Dahm teaches an authentication method/system/device, wherein said authentication server functionality is included in the VAS platform (Dahm col. 10 lines 20-24). The rational for combining are the same as claim 1 above.

As per claim 7, both McCombe and Dahm teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Dahm teaches an authentication method/system/device, wherein said authentication server functionality is provided by a dedicated authentication server (Dahm col. 10 lines 9-12 and lines 59-65). The rational for combining are the same as claim 1 above.

As per claims 8, and 21-26, both McCombe and Dahm teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Dahm teaches an authentication method/system/device, wherein said mapping information is generated by authentication client functionality in a GGSN (Dahm col. 10 lines 52-col. 11 lines 12). The rational for combining are the same as claim 1 above.

As per claims 9 and 27-28, both McCombe and Dahm teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition McCombe teaches an authentication method/system/device, wherein said mapping information is used for at least one of a service specific charging and addressing of mobile terminals (McCombe col. 3 lines 14-24).

As per claim 11, both McCombe and Dahm teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Dahm teaches an authentication method/system/device, wherein said gateway device is a GGSN (5) (Dahm col. 7 lines 8-28). The rational for combining are the same as claim 1 above.

As per claims 12 and 34, both McCombe and Dahm teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Dahm teaches an authentication method/system/device, wherein said

authentication client means (52) is a RADIUS client (Dahm Fig. 4 No. 440). The rational for combining are the same as claim 1 above.

As per claims 13, 35, and 36, both McCombe and Dahm teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Dahm teaches an authentication method/system/device, wherein said server (8) is a RADIUS server (Dahm Fig. 4 No. 440, 404 and 402). The rational for combining are the same as claim 1 above.

As per claims 15 and 40-43, both McCombe and Dahm teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Dahm teaches an authentication method/system/device, wherein said authentication client means (52) is arranged to transmit said mapping information in an access request message to said authentication server (8) (Dahm col. 10 lines 50-col. 11 lines 123). The rational for combining are the same as claim 1 above.

As per claim 17, both McCombe and Dahm teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Dahm teaches an authentication method/system/device, wherein said authentication client means (52) is arranged to transmit said mapping information in an access request message (Dahm col. 10 lines 50-col. 11 lines 123). The rational for combining are the same as claim 1 above.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eleni A Shiferaw whose telephone number is 571-272-3867. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Eleni Shiferaw

September 15, 2005


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100